UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/563,046	05/18/2006	Michael Weiler	081276-1082-00	6075
	7590 10/05/200 ST & FRIEDRICH LL	EXAMINER		
100 E WISCON	NSIN AVENUE	GRAHAM, GARY K		
Suite 3300 MILWAUKEE	, WI 53202		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
•			3727	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/05/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Comments	10/563,046	WEILER ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Gary K. Graham	3727				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	-· action is non-final.					
	, —					
•	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
	,					
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) <u>1-19</u> is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	·					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received					
•		on No				
_ .	•	u III tilis National Stage				
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date Notice of Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Notice of Informal Patent Application						
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 20051230 & 20080130. 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) Other:						
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the decoupling element having a hook-shaped end area with a material projection featuring several teeth arranged one after the other must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). While the fastening element appears to have such teeth, it is not clear where the decoupling element does. No new matter should be entered.

Also, the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: Reference numeral 55.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abevance.

Application/Control Number: 10/563,046 Page 3

Art Unit: 3727

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Further, such was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. While claim 13 sets forth that the decoupling element has a hook-shaped end area with a material projection featuring several teeth arranged one after the other, the specification does not appear to sufficiently describe such. There appears no original disclosure of several teeth one after the other on the decoupling element. Clarification is requested.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3-5, 7, 8 and 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 3, line 2, there is no antecedent basis for "the end area".

In claim 7, line 3, there is no antecedent basis for "the material projection", 'the end area" and "the hook".

In claim 8, line 3, there is no antecedent basis for "the disk".

Claim 14 appears somewhat confusing since it appears the material projection and the hookshaped end area of the decoupling element are the same component/area. The undercut has been defined as a material projection which is a hook-shaped end area of the decoupling element. It is not clear then how a disk can be arranged between the material projection and the hook-shaped end area. Clarification is requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-10, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Morin et al (WO patent 03/047926).

The patent to Morin discloses the invention as is claimed. Morin discloses a wiper device (20) for a motor vehicle. The device includes a wiper bearing (22) and a fastening element (50, 54) that is connected to a vehicle body (30). An elastomeric decoupling element (46) is arranged between the bearing and the fastening element. The decoupling element is detachably connected to the fastening element (see fig.4).

With respect to claims 3 and 8, note figure 12 of Morin, wherein the decoupling element is of a deformable material and provided with an undercut that receives thickened portion (98) at an end area of the fastening element (48,54). The fastening element also defines an undercut, as far as defined, with a diagonal bearing surface upon which the decoupling element rests.

With respect to claim 5, note figure 11. Fastening element, which includes part (64/88) made of deformable material, includes material projections thereon in the form of teeth which lie one after the other.

With respect to claim 12, such does not appear to define any particular structure not disclosed by Morin.

With respect to claim 13, note figure 8 which has deformable teeth (74b) in an end "area" of the decoupling element.

Art Unit: 3727

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morin et al (WO patent 03/047926).

The patent to Morin discloses all of the above recited subject matter with the exception of the fastening element being of plastics.

While Morin is silent as to fastening element material, to make such of any particular well known material appears but a mere design choice. Various well known materials, including plastics, metals, composites, etc are well established for use in the automotive wiper art. Plastics is a well established material in the wiper art known for its lightweight, durability and low cost.

It would have been obvious to one of skill in the art to make the fastening element of Morin of plastics, to provide a lightweight, durable element, as a mere choice of well known materials. One of ordinary skill in the art would choose an appropriate material for any particular component of the wiper device based more on the particular strength, cost etc desired than on any inventive concept.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gary K. Graham whose telephone number is 571-272-1274. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday to Friday (7:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Monica S. Carter can be reached on 571-272-4475. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/563,046

Art Unit: 3727

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Page 8

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system,

contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like

assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gary K Graham/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3727

GKG

30 September 2009